STUF, Akademie Verlag, 63 (2010) 3, 252–271

Silvia Kutscher (Berlin)

When 'towards' means 'away from': the case of directional-ablative syncretism in the Ardeşen variety of Laz (South-Caucasian)

Abstract

This paper deals with morphosyntactic and semantic characteristics of the spatial case called motative in the Ardeşen-variety of Laz. The motative can be used to mark the ground-nominal in allative as well as in ablative spatial expressions, while the ground-nominal in static spatial expressions is unmarked for case. Hence, the motative case shows a conflation of the allative with ablative spatial semantics, while at the same time excluding locative spatial meaning. Given that this kind of syncretism has been claimed to be non-existent, the findings for Ardeşen-Laz are of special relevance for the refinement of the typology on spatial case-systems.

Keywords: South-Caucasian, space in language, spatial cases, source/goal asymmetry, case syncretism

1. Introduction[1]

In the perception and description of spatial scenes, one entity, the figure (also called locatum or trajectory) is perceived as being in a spatial relation to another entity, the ground (also called relatum or landmark)[2]. The relation between figure and ground can be either dynamic or static, and spatial relations can in principle be divided up into three kinds of relations accordingly:

- static spatial scenes, i. e. configurations where a figure is located in relation to a ground (locative spatial scene),
- dynamic spatial scenes where the figure moves or is caused to move towards a ground (allative spatial scenes),
- dynamic spatial relations where the figure moves or is caused to move away from a ground (ablative spatial scenes).

Cross-linguistically, we find diverse means of expressing the semantic role of the ground (i. e. place, goal or source) morpho-syntactically. The coding type, which is of relevance for

[1] I would like to thank Dejan Matić, Camilla Di Biase-Dyson and three anonymous reviewers for inspiring comments on previous versions of this paper. I am also grateful to the patience and helpfulness of the Laz speakers in the region of Ardeşen and in Germany, who have supported my work for several years now.

[2] For locatum – relatum cf. Lehmann (1983), for figure – ground cf. Talmy (1985), for trajector – landmark cf. Langacker (1987).

this paper, is where special cases are used, i.e. spatial cases such as locative, allative, and ablative.[3]

The linguistic expression and conceptualisation of spatial relations has been a widely discussed topic in linguistic research within the last twenty to thirty years. Considering that the biological basis of the cognitive apparatus is shared by all human beings, it is assumed that the perception of spatial scenes is based on the shared principles of signal processing and signal interpretation. With respect to linguistic expression of spatial scenes, however, cross-linguistic research on the semantics of spatial expressions has shown that the conceptualisation of space is not only dependent on biological, but also on linguistic and cultural factors (e.g. Bowerman & Choi 2001, Levinson 2003, Levinson & Meira 2003; Levinson & Wilkins 2006, Brala 2007). Notwithstanding the diversity of the morpho-syntax and semantics of spatial expressions, typological studies have made a case for some linguistic universals. One of these universals is the assumed non-existence of a linguistic category which can be used to mark both the destination and the source of a motion in space, and cannot be used to mark place, i.e. the ground in a static spatial scene (Andrews 1985, Ikegami 1987, Stolz 1992, Creissels 2006).

In this paper, I will discuss the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of the motative case in the Ardeşen-variety of Laz. The motative can be used to mark the ground-nominal in allative as well as in ablative spatial expressions, whereas the ground-nominal in static spatial expressions is unmarked for case. I will argue that the existence of such a case makes it necessary to modify the typological assumptions about spatial case systems. Furthermore, I will also show that the motative case exhibits some asymmetries with respect to its use and semantics which are in accord with cognitive principles and cross-linguistic findings as discussed in the literature (e.g. Regier 1996, 1997, Regier & Zheng 2003, Lakusta & Landau 2005, Wälchli & Zúñinga 2006, Nikitina 2009).

2. Some basic facts on Ardeşen-Laz

As a sister language of Georgian, spoken on the south-eastern coast of the Black Sea, Laz is the only member of the South-Caucasian family which is spoken primarily outside of Georgia. The vast majority of its speakers live in Turkey and are bilingual in Laz and Turkish. Laz is a severely endangered language and it is used almost exclusively as a means of oral communication among family members. While most Laz older than forty are competent speakers of the language, an increasing number of young Laz are fluent only in Turkish, with a rapid decline of language competence with ethnic Laz younger than twenty (Kutscher 2008).

Laz as spoken in Turkey is divided into four dialectal variants (Pazar, Ardeşen, Vitse-Arhavi, Hopa), all of equal sociolinguistic status, since a standard variety of Laz has not been established (cf. Kutscher 2001: chapter 1). The variety of Laz discussed here is the one spoken in the city of Ardeşen and the villages of the Ardeşen region. Although this dialect (Ardeşen-Laz) is more or less similar to the other dialects with respect to verb morphology, it differs considerably from other Laz varieties with respect to its case marking system and argument linking rules (cf. Kutscher 2001: chapter 5). While all

[3] Apart from case marking the ground expression, additional morpho-syntactic devices such as adpositions, affixes on verbs, as well as lexical means such as systems of positional and motion verbs, may be used to encode the spatial relation expressed in an utterance.

other dialects of Laz have case marking relating to syntactic relations of core arguments (ergative, nominative, dative), Ardeşen-Laz does not mark core arguments for case (cf. 3 below).

Laz is an SOV language, exhibiting the categories of case and number in nominal expressions and a rich inventory of verbal categories with up to eight different morphological slots to be filled in the predicate, cf. (1).

(1) A B C D E F G H
NEG/MOD – preverb – 1/2person – version vowel – root – CAUS – TAM+P – number
(A or U) (voice, applicative) (non 3rd A)
An example of an inflected verb form is given in (2).

(2) *var-elebuxedit*
var-ele-b-u-xed-i-t
A-B-C-D-E-G-H
NEG-beside-1A-VV-sit-PAST.PFV+non_3rdA-PL
'We did not sit beside him/her/it.'

As (1) and (2) show, the information on person and number in Laz predicates is not marked by a single prefix but rather results from the interaction of prefixes and suffixes. These are portmanteau forms coding tense/aspect/mood as well as person (cf. MATTISSEN 1995). The person marking in the predicate is asymmetric. Only speech-act participants and 3rd person actors (in the sense of FOLEY & VAN VALIN 1984) are marked on the predicate. 3rd person undergoers (in the sense of FOLEY & VAN VALIN 1984) are unmarked or rather represented paradigmatically by absence of inflectional form (null-morpheme). Disregarding this asymmetry in the inflectional paradigm, predicates in Laz are head marking, with up to two arguments being represented in the verbal inflection, i.e. depending on the valence of the verb, verbal inflection is mono- or polypersonal. With polypersonal verbs the finite verb inflects for both actor and undergoer, cf. (3).

(3) *ce-**k**-çare*[4]
PRV-2U-beat:[1>**2**]SG:FUT.PFV[5]
'I will beat you!'

In contrast to its sister varieties, Ardeşen-Laz is an active language (KLIMOV 1974), i.e. monopersonal verbs subdivide into two classes, depending on whether the verb takes a controlling or non-controlling single core argument (also called semantic alignment system, cf. DONOHUE & WICHMANN 2008). Controlling single core arguments are marked as actor on the predicate, cf. the first person marker *b-* in (4a). Non-controlling single core arguments are marked as undergoer, cf. the first person marker *m-* in (4b). See also KUTSCHER (2009: 116 f.) for further discussion.

(4a) ***b-**ulur*
1A:go:SG:PRS
'I go.'

[4] Examples are written in the Lazoğlu/Feurstein-alphabet introduced to the Laz community in Turkey in 1984. It deviates from the Caucasianists' transcription in the following graphemes (<Laz = Caucasianist>): < ç = č>, <ǩ = č′>, <c = ǰ>, < ǩ = k′>, <p̌ = p′>, <ş = š>, <ť = t′>, <ʒ = c>, <ǯ = c′>.

[5] Polypersonal inflecting verbs are marked for two arguments. In the glosses this is represented by the sign ">", which indicates that an actor (A) is acting on an undergoer (U).

(4b) ***m-****açinden*
1.U-sneeze:SG:PRS
'I sneeze.'

While most Laz dialects have cases marking arguments (absolutive, ergative, dative) as well as adjuncts (cf. HOLISKY 1991), in the dialect of Ardeşen argument-NPs are always unmarked for case, cf. (5). This holds true for the actors of polypersonal predicates (5a, 5b), primary and secondary objects (in the sense of DRYER 1986), cf. (5b), and for the single core argument of monopersonal active and inactive predicates (5c).

(5a) *nana çay ǯiluy*
mother tea pluck:[3>3]SG:PRS
'Mother plucks tea.'

(5b) *oɣretmeni bere kitabi me-çay*
teacher child book thither-give:[3>3]SG:PRS
'The teacher gives the book to the child.'

(5c) *biči traɣuduy / biči aşǩurinen*
boy sing:3A:SG:PRS boy be_afraid:3U:SG:PRS
'The boy sings.' 'The boy is afraid.'

The case system in Ardeşen-Laz is restricted to marking adjunct phrases, such as instrumentals (*-te* 'INS', cf. 6a), comitatives (*-şǩala* 'COM'), benefactives (*-şeni* 'BEN', cf. 6b), goals and sources (*-şa* 'MOT'). See KUTSCHER (2001: chapter 5) for a detailed discussion of the case system in Ardeşen-Laz.

(6a) *ǯari-te go-çxu*
water-INS PRV-clean:3A:[3>3]SG:PST.PFV
'He cleaned it with water.' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 184]

(6b) (*si*) (*ma*) *bere-şeni kitabi me-m-çi-i* ?
2SG 1SG child-BEN book thither-1U-give:[2>1]SG:PRS-QU
'Did you give me the book for the child?'

As can be seen in (6b), the core arguments of the verb *mepçam* 'give' are unmarked for case, while the beneficient of the giving event, the child, is marked by the benefactive case marker *-şeni* 'BEN'. In the same way, temporal and locative adjuncts are unmarked for case as well, cf. (7).

(7) *livadi p-ǐraɣudum*
garden 1A-sing:SG:PRS
'I sing in the garden.'

Hence, non-actor third person core arguments and temporal/locative adjuncts cannot be formally distinguished but can only be differentiated on semantic grounds.

Expressions of spatial relations frequently have a verbal predicate prefixed by a preverb with spatial semantics. In these cases, the ground-NP of the spatial expressions is unmarked for case in static and in allative spatial expressions, cf. section 3.3. Since a spatial preverb has a two-place argument structure relating to the figure and the ground of a spatial configuration (LEHMANN 1983: 147 f.), we can conclude that ground-NPs unmarked for case are core arguments of the predicate. Since ground-NPs are most commonly non-speech-act participants and hence not overtly cross-referenced on the predicate in Laz, one cannot decide whether a ground-NP is a second or third argument in ditransitive constructions.

3. The basic characteristics of the motative

The term *motative* originates in a grammar of Laz by ROSEN (1844) and captures the particular semantics of this case, which only encodes that the referent of a figure nominal has moved with respect to the motative-marked ground-nominal, but it is vague with respect to whether the figure is moving towards a goal, as in (8a), or it moves away from a source, as in (8b).

(8a) *bere* *oxori-**şa*** *am-ulun*
child house-MOT into-go:3A:SG.PRS
'The child goes into the house.'

(8b) *bere* *oxori-**şa*** *gam-ulun*
child house-MOT out-go:3A:SG.PRS
'The child goes out of the house.'

The direction of movement is usually specified by a spatial prefix of the predicate, e. g. *amo-* 'into' in (8a) or *gamo-* 'out of' in (8b) or by inference from information given in the verb root and following from the properties of the figure and ground referents.

Motative-marking is unrestricted with respect to the semantic characteristics of the ground-nominal it relates to. A motative-marked ground can refer to a location in the physical domain (cf. 8 above) or to an animate entity (9a). Ground-NPs can also be abstract, non-physical ideas such as *muarebe* 'war' in (9b).

(9a) *doktori-**şa*** *g-i-onaten*
doctor-MOT 2U-VV-take:PL:FUT.PFV
'We will take you to the doctor.' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 217]

(9b) *çoyi* *biǐumi* *ǩoçe-pe* *muarebe-**şa*** *mend-axtey*
village all man-PL war-MOT thither-go:3A:PL:PAST.PFV
'All men in the village went to war.' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 150]

The motative is used not only to mark the destination of a motion or the origin from which a motion is initiated but also to mark ground-NPs which refer to a location about which a figure is moved or moves along, i. e. the motative can also have a (per)lative reading, cf. (10).

(10a) *a-* *ndɣa* *Ali* *mʒxuli-**şa*** *e-ulurǐu*
one day Ali pear.tree-MOT up-go:3A:SG:PAST.PFV
'One day Ali climbed a peartree.' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 10]

(10b) *tude-**şa*** *ǩoǯ-i-bu*
bottom-MOT down-VV-hang:3A:SG:PAST.PFV
'It (the swarm) hung (onto the tree's branch) to the ground.'
[KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 37]

3.1. Morphology of the motative

The motative has three allomorphic variants depending on the part-of-speech of the semantic nucleus of the phrase. For personal pronouns the form is *-de* (11a), for locative adverbs the form is *-le* (11b), while in all other instances (nouns, demonstrative, interrogative pronouns etc.) the form of the motative is *-şa* (11c). Note that a third person is referred

to by a demonstrative pronoun and not a personal pronoun, hence in dynamic spatial relations involving a third person the motative marker is *-şa* (11d).

(11a) *skan-**de*** *mo-xtasen*
2SG-MOT hither-go:3A:SG:FUT.PFV
S/He will come to you.'

(11b) *hako-**le*** *mo-xtasen*
here-MOT hither-go:3A:SG:FUT.PFV
'S/He will come here.'

(11c) *oxori-**şa*** *mo-xtasen*
house-MOT hither-go:3A:SG:FUT.PFV
'S/He will come to the house.'

(11d) *himu-**şa*** *mo-xtasen*
DEM/3SG-MOT hither-go:3A:SG:FUT.PFV
'S/He will come to him/her.'

If the personal pronoun is used attributively (i.e., as a possessive expression), the form of the motative is *-şa*. Hence, in complex phrases the choice of the allomorph is in accordance with the semantic nucleus of the phrase and not with the part-of-speech of the host of the case affix, as example (12) illustrates.[6]

(12) *nana* *skani-**şa*** *mo-xtasen*
mother 2SG:POSS-MOT hither-go:3A:SG:FUT.PFV
'S/He will come to your mother.'

As opposed to the example given in (11a), the goal-phrase in (12) is marked with the *-şa* allomorph since the semantic nucleus of the phrase is *nana* and the pronoun *skani* '2SG' is used attributively. It is marked with the nominal form of the motative although the pronoun is the host of the case affix and according to the part-of-speech of the pronoun the case form expected to be applied would be *-de.*

3.2. Non-spatial functions of the motative case

Apart from marking the ground-NP in a spatial expression, the motative has expanded to cover four non-spatial functions. The fact that in typological perspective, some of the functions are related to the allative case, while others are related to the ablative, supports the assumption that the motative case of Ardeşen-Laz is the result of a syncretism of the two spatial cases *-şa* 'ALL' and *-şen* 'ABL' which are still present in other Laz dialects. In the following subsections each of the non-spatial functions of the motative will shortly be illustrated.

[6] Note that Laz has group inflection, i.e. case and number are only marked once per phrase. Case is marked on the last element of a phrase, while number is hosted by the semantic nucleus of the phrase, cf. KUTSCHER (2001: chapter 4).

3.2.1. Endpoints in time

The motative can be used in temporal expressions relating to a point in time at which a state-of-affairs is bound to end, cf. (13), a reading which relates to the **allative** sense of the motative.

(13) *çumani-şi* *ko-m-ulunan* *lumca-**şa*** *ko-dogutunan*
morning-GEN MOD-hither-go:3A:PL:PRS evening-MOT MOD-stay.3A:PL:PRS
'They (the soldiers) come in the morning and stay until evening.'
[KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 153]

3.2.2. Comparison

Motative is used to mark the standard of comparison in comparative constructions (i. e. the source of the comparison), cf. (14). This extension of a spatial case to a non-spatial function is typologically frequently found with the **ablative** case marker (e. g. CREISSELS 2008).

(14) *hami* *oxori* *himu* *oxori-**şa*** *didi* *on*
DEM.PROX house DEM.DIST house-MOT big be:3A:SG:PRS
'This house is bigger than that house.'

3.2.3. Exclusion

Motative is also used to mark referents that are excluded from a group of referents, a sense which conceptually relates more to the **ablative** sense of the motative. An illustration of this extension of the motative case is given in (15) where the motative-marked expression refers to the only piece of land that is in the possession of the grandfather of the narrator, whereas every other field in the village belongs to other people.

(15) *a* *Ǐǐo Avla-**şa*** *başka* *soti* *var-* *u ɣurǐu*
one 'placename'-MOT other somewhere NEG have:3U:SG:PAST.IPV
'He owned nothing apart from Ǐǐo Avla.' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 72]

3.2.4. Adverbial clauses of time/condition

Motative can serve as a marker of a subordinate sentence in adverbial function. A somewhat peculiar property of Laz (all varieties, cf. HOLISKY 1991: 409, cf. also HARRIS & CAMPBELL 1995: 145) is that case forms may be hosted by finite verb forms and express adverbial sentence meaning. In this kind of construction, the motative expresses an overlap in time between two events, i. e. an extension of time during which another event occurs (time adverbial of simultaneity), cf. (16). This is a function that relates neither to allative nor ablative case, but is typologically rather related to locative cases.

(16) *bere* *b-orǐi-**şa*** *dido* *ɣunni* *m-i-ɣurǐey*
child 1A-be:PAST.IPV-MOT many beehive 1U-VV-have:PL:PAST.IPV
'When I was a child, we had many beehives.'

Conditional readings are also possible, cf. (17).

(17) "*bo* *nana* *namazi-şi* *derdi* *g-i-ɣun-i*?"
dear mother prayer-GEN sorrow 2U-VV-have:SG:PRS-QU
"va. *namazi* *va-p̌-a-**şa*** *va-b-ulur."*
no prayer NEG-1A-do:SG:OPT.PFV-MOT NEG-1A-go:SG:PRS
"Mother, don't you have (any other) worries (than) your prayers?" "No, I can't go without having prayed!" [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 50]

Note that causal relations, which are frequently encoded by the ablative case in the languages of the world (CREISSELS 2008) are marked with the instrumental (18a), and adverbial clauses of purpose are marked with *-şeni* 'BEN' (18b) in Ardeşen-Laz.

(18a) *şk̆urina-**te*** *ognam* *ya*
fear-INS hear:[2>3]SG.PRS QUOT
'"You only hear it because you are frightened.'" [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 51]

(18b) *mektubi* *onçaru-**şeni*** *çaɣeť i* *e-p̌-çopum*
letter write:VN-BEN paper up-1A-take:PRS:SG
'I buy paper in order to write the letter.'

Having set out the major characteristics of the clause structure in general (section 2) and the major characteristics of the motative case (section 3) in Ardeşen-Laz, in the following sections we will turn to the structure of spatial expressions in general (section 4.1), as well as the morphosyntactic characteristics and the spatial semantics of the motative case (section 4.2–4.4). In section 5 the semantic asymmetry between the allative and the ablative reading of the motative case is discussed and motivated on cognitive grounds. Section 6 gives a concluding summary of the findings in the paper.

4. The use of the motative case in spatial expressions

4.1. Basic spatial constructions in Laz

Basic Spatial Constructions[7] in Laz, i.e. expressions that are given as discourse-pragmatically unmarked answers to questions like "where is X?" in the case of static spatial scenes and "where to/from where is X moving/being moved?" in the case of dynamic spatial scenes, are constructed as containing three constituents: a NP referring to the entity being located (the figure), a NP referring to the place in which the figure is located or moved to or from (the ground) and a predicate. The predicate forms a part of a morphologically complex structure containing an inflected verb relating to the spatial orientation and shape characteristics of the figure (the spatial verb), together with a preverb giving spatial information about the configuration between figure and ground (the spatial relator). Ardeşen-Laz has 27 preverbs which cover both the spatial and the deictic domain. Most of the preverbs used in descriptions of spatial scenes are not restricted to either dynamic or static spatial relations, but are rather neutral in this respect, i.e. they can be used in both kinds of expressions (19a, 19b).

[7] The term Basic Spatial Expression is based on the term Basic Locative Construction as used by LEVINSON (2000), LEVINSON & WILKINS (2006).

(19a) *zeytini* *yaɣi* *dolo-b-u-bi*
olive oil in-1A-VV-pour:[1>3]SG:PAST.PFV
'I poured olive oil into (the cow's mouth).' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 34]

(19b) *şişe* *ťikǩina* *dolo-zun*
bottle pannier in-lie:3A:SG:PRS
'The bottle is in the basket (lit.: pannier).'

A minority of preverbs, however, are restricted to expressions of dynamic spatial scenes. These are listed in (20).

(20) *ama-, gama-, meo-, moo-, moǩo-, e-, eşǩa-, ceşǩa-*

Table (1) gives an overview on the spatial as well as the deictic preverbs together with tentative translations of their meanings into English. For a more detailed account on the semantics and use of the preverbs cf. KUTSCHER (2003, 2010).

spatial domain	deictic domain
<u>non-projective</u> *ama-* 'into' *ce-* 'steep down, on(to), in(to)' *cela-* 'sidewards down, on(to)' *ceşǩa-* 'down into amidst' *dolo-* 'in(to), down through, down along' *e-* 'steep up' *ela-* 'sidewards up, besides' *eşǩa-* 'up (through) amidst' *gama-* 'out of' *gola-* 'on(to)' *goo-* 'on(to)' *mele-* 'in, out of' *meşǩa-* 'in(to) (through) amidst' *mola-* 'in(to)' <u>circum</u> *go-* 'around' <u>projective</u> *eǩa-* 'behind' *eǯa-* 'under' *ǩoǯo-* 'in(to) front, aside, over' <u>more than one entity as F or G</u> *eo-* 'on(to) another' *ǩoşǩa-* 'heap-wise, into one another, amidst' *oǩo-* 'asunder, together' <u>non-transparent</u> *oxo-* 'accumulation?'	<u>deictic</u> *me-* 'thither' *mo-* 'hither' <u>deictic+spatial</u> *meo-* 'across thither' *moo-* 'across hither, (towards) on top of another' *mola-* 'hither horizontally, in(to)' *gola-* 'thither horizontally, on(to)' *moǩo-* 'hither asunder, hither "hook"'

Table 1: System of preverbs in Ardeşen-Laz

The constructional properties of spatial expressions differ with respect to whether the spatial configurations the expressions refer to are static or dynamic. With static spatial expressions the ground-NP is unmarked for case, while in dynamic spatial expressions the ground may be marked with the motative case (details will be given in section 4.2). The following examples give the two constructional schemes together with some language examples.

4.1.1. Static spatial expressions

The construction scheme of a static spatial expression in Laz is given in (21).

(21)	Figure	Ground	[Relator	verbroot+inflection]$_{\text{SpatialConfiguration}}$
	NP	NP	PRV-	Manner+TAM+P
	şişe	*masa*	***goo-***	*dgun*
	bottle	table	on	stand:3A:SG:PRS

As is evident from example (21), the Laz variety under scrutiny in this paper clearly has no morphological marking of the ground-NP expressing the semantic role of place whatsoever. It is neither marked by case nor do we find adpositional marking in the phrase relating to the ground.

This differs from other varieties of Laz, where the semantic role of place is marked with the dative case affix, cf. (22) (see also Holisky 1991: 409).

(22) Vitse-Arhavi (Fındıklı)

a	*msk'fa*	*bozo*	*kojiroms*	*ham*	*oxori-**s***
a	pretty	girl	he.sees	this	house-**in**

'He sees a pretty girl in that house.' [Anderson 1963: 113]

[cp. Ardeşen: *ham* ***oxori*** *a* *mskv̌a* *bozomota* *aziren*
DEM house a pretty girl see:3A:PRS
'He sees a pretty girl in this house.']

Different positions of the figure are expressed by a set of verbs expressing spatial positions of figures with respect to specific properties of the figure referent (such as geometric properties, canonical vs. non-canonical orientation, individualized vs. mass-like, etc.), cf. Kutscher & Genç (2007). For instance, in (21), the positional verb PRV-*dgun* (which is used with non-mass like figures that have a canonical vertical orientation) is chosen by the speaker because the spatial configuration of the expression refers to a bottle in a vertical position. If the bottle had been located horizontally the speaker would have chosen PRV-*zun* 'it is lying', a verb which is used with non-mass like figures which lack a canonical orientation (23).

(23)

şişe	*masa*	*goo-*	*zun*
bottle	table	on	lie:3A:SG:PRS

'The bottle is (lying) on the table.'

4.1.2. Dynamic spatial expressions

The construction scheme of dynamic spatial expressions is given in (24).

(24)

Figure	Ground(-Case)	[Relator	verbroot+inflection]$_{SpatialConfiguration}$
NP	NP(-MOT)	PRV-	Manner+TAM+P
şişe	*masa*	*goo-*	*bdum*
bottle	table	on	1A-put:[1>3]SG:PRS

As the scheme and language example illustrate, in dynamic spatial expressions the ground-NP is not obligatorily marked with a case marker. The presence of the case marker is conditioned by the characteristics of the spatial relator, the verb stem and by discourse-pragmatics. If a dynamic spatial expression does only exhibit a simplex verb, i.e. a verb that does not have a preverb, then the use of the motative case is obligatory (cf. 25 below). With verbs of motion and caused motion that contain a preverb, the use of the motative exhibits further complexity and will be examined in more detail in section 4.2.

4.2. Use of the motative case in spatial expressions

The use of the motative is determined by the presence or absence of a spatial preverb. As already mentioned, with motion event predicates which do not contain a preverb, the ground-NP is obligatorily marked with the motative case, cf. (25).

(25a) *neǩna-**şa*** *b-ulur*
door-MOT 1A-go:SG:PRS
'I go to the door.'

(25b) **neǩna* *b-ulur*
door 1A-go:SG:PRS

With verbs of motion and caused motion containing a preverb, the factors responsible for the use of the motative as a marker of the ground-NP are more complex; the expressions exhibit a clear asymmetry between the use of motative in allative vs. ablative spatial relations. This will be discussed in the remainder of this section.

4.2.1. Allative spatial relations

In allative spatial expressions containing a preverb, the ground-NP is linguistically coded as a core argument, as (26) illustrates. In (26a) the ground-NP is unmarked for case and the addition of the motative case to the ground-NP renders the expression ungrammatical (26b), i.e. in allative spatial expressions containing a preverb the ground-NP cannot be marked with the oblique motative case.

(26a) *tencere* *ǯari* ***dolo**-b-o-bam*
pot water into-1A-VV-pour:[1>3]SG:PRS
'I pour water into the pot'

(26b) **ǯari* *tencere-**şa*** *dolo-b-o-bam*
water pot-MOT into-1A-VV-pour:[1>3]SG:PRS

(26c) *tencere-şa* *žari* *b-o-bam* → **tencere žari bobam*
pot-MOT water 1A-VV-pour:[1>3]SG:PRS
'I pour water to/from the pot.'

Utterances such as the one presented in the following example (27) seem to be exceptions to this.

(27) *ǩarmaǩe-**şa*** ***ce**-b-ulur* → **ǩarmate*
mill-MOT down-1A-go:SG:PRS
'I go down to the mill.'

In (27) the NP *ǩarmateşa,* which clearly is the destination of the speaker's motion, is marked with motative case obligatorily. This is explained by the fact that the preverb *ce-* 'down on(to)' does not semantically relate to the mill as the ground of the motion event, but rather to the path of the downward motion, i.e. the motative-marked goal expression is not an argument introduced by the preverb but rather an adjunct. This can be seen by the fact that a NP unmarked for case can be added to the utterance in (28) that relates to the ground argument of the predicate introduced by preverb *ce-*, e.g. *gza* 'path, road'.

(28) *gza* *ǩarmaǩe-**şa*** ***ce**-b-ulur*
path mill-MOT down-1A-go:SG:PRS
'I go down the path to the mill.'

Exceptionally, the allative spatial preverb *amo-* 'horizontally into' allows the alternation between the two constructions. The ground-NP may either be unmarked for case (29a) or it may bear motative case marking (29b). In both cases the meaning of the expression is the same.

(29a) *čuvali* *oxori* *amo-p-torum*
sack house into-1A-carry:[1<3]SG:PRS
'I carry the sack into the house.'

(29b) *čuvali* *oxori-**şa*** *amo-p-torum*
sack house-MOT into-1A-carry:[1<3]SG:PRS
'I carry the sack into the house.'

The same pattern of alternation can be found for the ablative spatial preverb *gamo-* 'horizontally out of', cf. (30), even though the ablative spatial expression usually takes both the preverb and the motative case (cf. 31 below).

(30a) *ǩoçi* *hani* *aziras-i* *na*
man DEM.PROX:PL see:3U:SG:OPT.PFV-SUB NOM'er
impulen *yeri-**şa*** ***gama**-xtasen* *deila*
hide:3A:SG:PRS place-MOT out-come:3A:SG:FUT:PFV QUOT
'"When the man sees this (our doings), he'll come out of his hiding space", they said'
[KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 154 f.]

(30b) *him* *žižila-pe-şi* *maɣara* *ko-**gama**-xtu*
DEM snake-PL-GEN cave MOD-out-come:3A:SG:PAST.PFV
'He came out of the cave of the snakes.' [KUTSCHER & GENÇ 1998: 237]

Etymologically, both *amo-* and *gamo-* are compounds of the spatial preverbs *a-/ga-* and the deictic preverb *mo-* 'towards a speech-act participant'. Deictic preverbs in Ardeşen-Laz are construed with a motative-case-marked ground-NP obligatorily, cf. (31). The difference in the behaviour of the deictic preverbs may be motivated by the fact that they denote the direction of a motion event with respect to speech-act participants, i.e. they have a perspectivising rather than a relational function as we see with spatial preverbs.

(31a) *oxori-**şa*** *me-b-ulur* (**oxori me-bulur*)
house-MOT thither-1A-go:SG:PRS
'I go away from the house.'

(31b) *bere* *araba-**şa*** *mo-b-i-onam* (**araba mo-bionam*)
child car-MOT hither-1A-VV-carry:SG:PRS
'I carry the child to the car.'

The fact that *amo-* and *gamo-* display this alternation pattern may thus have its origin in the circumstance that they contain a deictic element as well as a spatial one which led, at an earlier stage of the language, to a conflict in the argument realisation of the ground participant.

A third exception are the preverbs *e-* 'up', *eşǩe-* 'up in middle', *eşǩe-* 'down in middle'. Like *amo-* 'horizontally into' and *gamo-* 'horizontally out of', they are restricted to the use in descriptions of dynamic spatial scenes. In contrast to *amo-* and *gamo-*, they do not allow alternation in the case marking of the ground-NP, but only take ground-NPs which are marked with motative (cp. 28 vs. 10a).

4.2.2. Ablative spatial relations

In the case of ablative spatial expressions containing a complex predicate with a preverb (except *gamo-*, cf. 30 above), the ground-NP is obligatorily marked with the motative, cf. (32).

(32a) *oşǩuri* *tasi-**şa*** *e-p̌-ç̌opam* → **tasi*
apple bowl-MOT up-1A-take:[1>3]SG:PRS
'I take the apple out of the bowl.'

(32b) *çanta* *dolabi-**şa*** ***ce**-b-i-ɣam* → **dolabi*
bag wardrobe-MOT down-1A-VV-take:PRS
'I take the bag down from the (top of the) wardrobe.'

As (32) illustrates, for the description of ablative spatial relations the figure's motion path away from the ground is decisive for the choice of the preverb and not the fact that there is an ablative motion as such. Preverbs which can be used in dynamic spatial expressions are not restricted to either allative or ablative spatial expressions. If their semantics is compatible with these expression types, they can be used in both. For example, in cases where the starting location of the figure is above the torso height of the agent, like the top of a wardrobe, the preverb *ce-* 'down' is chosen, relating to the fact that the figure's path is a downward motion (32b). In cases where the path of the figure-referent follows an upward motion with respect to the torso of the agent, e.g. when lifting something from a pannier or a table, the preverb *e-* 'up' is used (32a). The choice of the preverb in each case is without alternative.

4.2.3. Interrelation of spatial preverbs and case marking

In sum, we can state that spatial preverbs add a new semantic argument to the base verb, namely the ground of a spatial scene. Whether the ground is realized as a core argument, however, depends on at least one of three factors. The first factor is the semantics of the spatial construction: In allative spatial constructions the ground is a core argument of the construction, in ablative spatial constructions as well as in deictic constructions and constructions with preverbless predicates, the ground NP is marked with the oblique case motative. Hence, allative spatial scenes are construed as highly transitive (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson 1980), while ablative spatial scenes are not. This difference in behaviour has also been reported for other languages (Ikegami 1987, Lestrade 2008) and may well be related to the difference in cognitive salience between goals and sources which will be discussed in section 5.

A second factor which determines the case marking of the ground-NP is a lexical one. While most spatial preverbs either take ground-NPs in motative case (for ablative readings) or ground-NPs unmarked for case (for allative readings), the preverbs *e-* 'up', *eşǩe-* 'up amidst' and *ceşǩe-* 'down amidst' obligatorily take ground-NPs marked with the motative case in both the allative and the ablative readings.

For the preverbs *amo-* 'into' and *gamo-* 'out of', a third factor seems to be of importance, namely discourse pragmatics. Both preverbs allow alternation between the more transitive construction with the ground-NP construed as a core argument and the less transitive construction with the ground-NP marked with the oblique case motative. The details of this alternation have not been studied so far and need further investigation.

4.3. Allative and Ablative marking in other Laz varieties

In other Laz varieties, goal and source marking is distributed over two discrete cases. For allative spatial configurations the ground is marked by the allative case marker *-şa/-şe* (33a, 33c) whereas in ablative spatial configuration, the source-NP is marked by the ablative case marker *-şen* 'ABL' (33b, 33c), cf. also Holisky (1991), Lacroix (2009).

(33) Vitse-Arhavi (Fındıklı)

(33a) *Ali* *Vice-**şe*** *komulun*
Ali Vitse-to comes
'Ali comes to Vitse.' [Anderson 1963: 111]

(33b) *Poli-**šen*** *Turani*
Istanbul-from Turhan
'Turhan from Istanbul.' [Anderson 1963: 110]

(33c) *oxori* *čkimi-**še*** *moxti* *var* *uc'umes* *hemen*
house mine-to come not he.says immediately
iani *muši-**šen*** *igzalas*
ide his-from he.goes
'He (Turhan) doesn't say, "Come to my house!" Immediately he (Ali) goes away from him.' [Anderson 1963: 117]

As has been shown in section 4.2, the variety of Ardeşen differs from all other dialects of Laz, since it does not differentiate between a goal and a source reading. The exceptional case of Ardeşen-Laz might be a result of a phonetically motivated syncretism of the two forms into one. But since there are no data available on the earlier stages of the language, this assumption can only be based on the phonological near-similarity and on the unusual semantics of the motative case in combination with semantic asymmetries to be discussed in section 5 below and the non-spatial uses of the motative, as have been illustrated in section 3 above.

5. Semantic asymmetry of the motative in spatial expressions

The semantic conflation of source and goal readings has never been reported before for other languages (Andrews 1985, Ikegami 1987, Stolz 1992, Creissels 2006) and is sometimes even ruled out categorically as a cognitive possibility, considering the fact that motion towards a ground and motion away from a ground are spatial events which are in opposition to each other and exclude each other semantically. In the rest of this paper, we will deal with the semantics of this somewhat unusual case.

In simple terms, the meaning of the motative case is vague with respect to expressing a motion towards a goal or away from a source, as was demonstrated in (8). Upon scrutiny, however, a clear semantic asymmetry can be found with respect to the interpretation of its meaning. In context-free elicited utterances, speakers have a strong preference to interpret motative case as a marker for an allative spatial relation. For instance, when presenting expressions such as the one given in (34), the intuition of the native speakers is to interpret the utterance as an expression for someone moving to the house and to negate the possibility of interpreting the utterance as expressing a movement away from the house.

(34) *oxori-**şa*** *ulun*
house-MOT go:3A:SG:PRS
'S/He goes to the house.'
*'S/He goes away from the house.'

The above-described preference for a directional reading of the motative in context-free utterances is in accordance with findings in acquisition research and psychology. It can be explained by the asymmetry between the use of goal and source expressions which is based on a conceptual bias for goal paths. In several studies on the acquisition of English (Freeman et al. 1980, Landau & Zukowski 2003, Lakusta & Landau 2005), it has been shown that even in children's early speech there is an asymmetry of encoding goals and sources in path expressions: children regularly refer to the goal and the goal path expression in a directional motion event, but almost always omit the source and source path expression in a motion event that depicts motion away from a reference object. Likewise in psychological research it has been shown that perceivers of a spatial configuration focus their attention more on the endpoint than on the starting point of a motion event (Regier 1996, 1997, Regier & Zheng 2007). Based on several experiments with normally developing children and children suffering from Williams syndrome[8] as well as English speaking

[8] People suffering from Williams syndrome show normal speech abilities while having severe spatial impairments.

adults, Lakusta & Landau (2005) argue that the bias towards the goal path in linguistic expressions is caused by a conceptual goal-biased perspective on events (which can be overridden on pragmatic grounds, i.e. by unusual, non-every-day situations exhibiting extraordinary source paths). Furthermore, since the goal path bias is present even in pre-linguistic children, Lakusta & Landau (2005) argue that the goal path bias is indeed a conceptual bias and not a linguistic bias driven by frequency effects. The fact that frequency of goal expressions in many languages is generally much higher than source expressions could thus be accounted for as an epiphenomenon of a cognitively grounded goal path bias, a universal cognitive feature which might be due to properties of the attentional and memory systems of human brains (cf. Regier 1997, Lakusta & Landau 2005, Ihara & Fujita 2000).

In Laz we find additional evidence that goals are of higher salience to the language user than sources when considering that the subpart of the preverb system containing expressions for goals is more elaborate than that for expressing source configurations.

Laz has a rather complex system of spatial relators prefixed to the verb stem (spatial preverbs, cf. Kutscher 2003, 2007). However, in Laz we find a clear asymmetry in the structure of the preverb inventory: for stance and allative motion, the system of preverbs is much bigger in size than for ablative motion. The number of preverbs for ablative relations is much smaller, with less fine-grained semantics and several allative spatial concepts correlating with just one ablative spatial concept (cf. 35). Moreover, except from the preverb *gamo-* 'out of' the preverbs used in ablative spatial expressions can also be used in descriptions of allative spatial scenes, i.e. they are neutral with respect to referring to the starting or endpoint of a motion. The decisive factor for the choice of a preverb in ablative spatial expressions is the vertical axis of the motion, cf. (35–38). In locative and allative spatial expressions on the other hand, the vertical axis is only one of several parameters (for more details cf. Kutscher 2010).

gama- 'out of, away from (Ground is horizontal 35 or neutral 36)':

(35a) *porça* *dolabi* ***mola****-b-dum* → *dolabi-şa* ***gamo****-b-i-ɣam*
dress wardrobe in-1A-put:PRS wardrobe-MOT out-1A-VV-take:PRS
'I put the dress into the wardrobe.' 'I take it out of the wardrobe.'

(35b) *cari* *soba* ***meşǩa****-b-dum* → *soba-şa* ***gamo****-b-i-ɣam*
bread oven in-1A-put:PRS oven-MOT out-1A-VV-take:PRS
'I put the bread into the oven.' 'I take it out of the oven.'

(36) *çitabi* *kapaɣi* ***mo****-b-o-dum* → *kapaɣi-şa* ***gamo****-b-i-ɣam*
book slip.case in-1A-VV-put:PRS slip.case out-1A-VV-take:PRS
'I put the book into the slip case.' 'I take it out of the slip case.'

e- 'out of, away from (Ground is below)':

(37a) *oşǩuri* *tasi* ***ce****-b-dum* → *tasi-şa* ***e****-ǩ-çopum*
apple bowl down-1A-put:PRS bowl-MOT up-1A-take.PRS
'I put the apple into the bowl.' 'I take it out of the bowl.'

(37b) *kuzi* *bardaɣi* ***dolo****-b-dum* → *bardaɣi-şa* ***e****-ǩ-çopum*
spoon glass in-1A-put:PRS glass-MOT up-1A-take:PRS
'I put the spoon into the glass.' 'I take it out of the glass.' ****gamo****-b-iɣam*

(37c) *çitabi* *ti* ***goo**-b-dum* → *ti-şa* ***e**-ǰ-çopum*
book head on-1A-put:PRS head-MOT up-1A-take:PRS
'I put the book on the head.' 'I take it from the head.'

ce- '(down) away from (Ground is above)':

(38a) *çanta* *dolabi* *g**oo**-b-dum* → *dolabi-şa* ***ce**-b-i-ɣam*
bag wardrobe on-1A-put:PRS wardrobe-MOT dwn-1A-VV-take:PRS
'I put the bag on the top of the wardrobe.' 'I take it (down) from the wardrobe.'

cp:

(38b) *çanta* *hali/masa* ***goo**-b-dum* → *hali-şa/m.-şa* ***e**-ǰ-çopum*
bag rug/table on-1A-put:PRS rug/table-MOT up-1A-VV-take:PRS
'I put the bag on the rug/table.' 'I take it from the rug/table.'

This asymmetry in the inventory of spatial relators is also reported for other languages such as English, Dutch, Korean and Tzotzil Maya (cf. BOWERMAN 1996, BOWERMAN et al. 1995).

More evidence for an asymmetry between goal and source concepts is the difference in the distribution of the motative in Ardeşen-Laz. As was discussed in section 2 and 4.4, ground-NPs in allative spatial expressions are realised as core arguments of the spatial predicates, i.e. they are unmarked for case and may be represented by verbal inflection, while ground-NPs in ablative spatial expressions are obligatorily marked by the motative case (with the exception of predicates containing the preverb *amo*- 'horizontally into' or *gamo*- 'horizontally out of', cf. 29 and 30). Hence, with respect to markedness, the conceptually more unmarked category goal is expressed in the linguistically unmarked construction while the conceptually marked source is realised in a more marked manner with respect to its morphological form.

6. Conclusion

In sum, we find that Ardeşen-Laz differs from the other varieties of Laz with respect to its case-system: Ardeşen-Laz does not exhibit core cases and has a motative case which conflates the allative with the ablative function while at the same time excluding locative spatial meaning. While this kind of conflation seems to be typologically exceptional and conceptionally rather unmotivated, the semantics and use of the motative show some asymmetries which indicate that, upon scrutiny, the properties of the motative fit with the cognitive goal path bias which is claimed to be universal in humans by researchers on language acquisition and psychology. These asymmetries are i) a tendency to interpret motative-marked grounds as goals in expressions without preverbs, ii) a more fine-grained inventory of preverbs referring to allative motion, and iii) a difference in markedness such that the cognitively more marked source expressions are also linguistically more marked, i.e. the fact that source expressions are marked obligatorily with motative, while goal-NPs are unmarked for case in expressions containing a preverb as a spatial relator.

Abbreviations

A	actor	OPT	optative
ABL	ablative	P	person
ALL	allative	PAST	past
BEN	benefactive	PFV	perfective
CAUS	causative	PL	plural
COM	comitative	POSS	possessive
GEN	genitive	PROX	proximal
DAT	dative	PRS	present tense
DEM	demonstrative	PRV	preverb
DIST	distal	QU	question marker
FUT	future	QUOT	quotative marker
INS	instrumental	SG	singular
IPV	imperfective	SUB	subordination marker
MOD	speaker modality/focus particle	TAM	tense/aspect/mood
MOT	motative case	U	undergoer
NEG	negation	VN	verbal noun (masdar)
NOM	nominative	VV	version vowel
NOM'er	nominaliser		

[>] verb form is marked for two arguments, actor (=A) acting on undergoer (=U)

References

Anderson, Ralph D. (1963): A grammar of Laz. Dissertation, University of Texas. Ann Arbor Universtiy Microfilms.

Andrews, Avery (1985): The major functions of the noun phrase, in: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. 1: Clause structure*. Cambridge: University, 62–154.

Bowerman, Melissa (1996): Learning how to structure space for language: a cross-linguistic perspective, in: Bloom, Paul; Peterson Mary; Nadel, Lynn & Garrett, Merrill F. (eds.), *Language and space*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 365–436.

Bowerman, Melissa; de Lourdes, Leon & Chooi, Soonja (1995): Verbs, particles, and spatial semantics: learning to talk about spatial actions in typologically different languages, in: Clark, Eve V. (ed.), *The proceedings of the 27th annual child language research forum*. Stanford: Center for the study of language and information, 101–110.

Bowerman, Melissa & Chooi, Soonja (2001): Shaping meanings for language: universal and language-specific in the acquisition of spatial semantic categories, in: Bowerman, Melissa & Levinson, Stephen C. (eds.), *Language acquisition and conceptual development.* Cambridge: University, 475–511.

Brala, Marija M. (2007): Spatial 'on' – 'in' categories and their prepositional codings across languages: universal constraints on language specificity, in: Schaelley, Andrea C. & Zaefferer, Dietmar (eds.), *Ontolinguistics. How ontological status shapes the linguistic coding of concepts.* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 176). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 299–330.

Creissels, Denis (2006): Encoding the distinction between location, source, and destination: a typological study, in: Hickmann, Maya & Robert, Stéphane (eds.), *Space in languages: linguistic systems and cognitive categories.* (Typological Studies in Language 66). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 19–28.

Creissels, Denis (2008): Spatial cases, in: Malchukov, Andrej & Spencer, Andrew (eds.), *The handbook of case*. (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics). Oxford: University.

Donohue, Mark & Wichmann, Søren (eds.) (2008): *The typology of semantic alignment*. (Oxford Linguistics). Oxford: University.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1986): Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative, in: *Language* 62, 808–845.

Foley, William A. & Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. (1984): *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38). Cambridge: University.

Freeman, N. H.; Sinha, C.G. & Stedmon, J. A. (1980): The allative bias in three-year-olds is almost proof against task naturalness, in: *Journal of Child Language* 8, 283–296.

Harris, Alice C. & Campbell, Lyle (1995): *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74). Cambridge: University.

Holisky, Dee A. (1991): Laz, in: Harris, Alice C. (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Bd. 1: The Kartvelian languages.* (Anatolian and Caucasian Studies). Delmar/New York: Caravan Books, 395–472.

Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. (1980): Transitivity in grammar and discourse, in: *Language* 56(2), 251–299.

Ihara, Hiroko & Fujita, Ikuyo (2000): A cognitive approach to errors in case marking in Japanese agrammatism: the priority of the goal *-ni* over the source *-kara*, in: Foolen, Ad & van der Leek, Frederike (eds.), *Constructions in cognitive linguistics: Selected papers from the fifth international cognitive linguistics conference, Amsterdam, 1997*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 123–140.

Ikegami, Yoshihiko (1987): 'Source' vs. 'Goal': a case of linguistic dissymmetry, in: Dirven, René & Radden, Günter (eds.), *Concepts of case.* (Studien zur englischen Grammatik 4). Tübingen: Narr, 122–145.

Klimov, G. A. (1974): On the character of active languages, in: *Linguistics* 131, 11–23.

Kutscher, Silvia (2001): *Nomen und nominales Syntagma im Lasischen. Eine deskriptive Analyse des Dialekts von Ardeşen.* (Studies in Caucasian Languages 17). München: Lincom Europa.

Kutscher, Silvia (2003): Raumkonzeptualisierung im lasischen Verb: Das System der deiktischen und topologischen Präverbien, in: Boeder, Winfried (ed.), *Kaukasische Sprachprobleme.* (Caucasica Oldenburgensia 1). Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität, 223–246.

Kutscher, Silvia (2007): *Locative classification and orientation of the configuration: Spatial conceptualisation in Laz,* paper read at the "Conference on the Languages of the Caucasus", 07th–09th December 2007, Max-Planck-Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig/Germany. URL: http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/conference/07-CaucasusConference/pdf/handout/Kutscher_handout_LocClassLaz.pdf

Kutscher, Silvia (2008): The language of the Laz in Turkey: contact-induced change or gradual language loss?, in: *Turkish Languages* 12, 82–102.

Kutscher, Silvia (2009): *Kausalität und Argumentrealisierung. Zur Konstruktionsvarianz bei Psychverben in europäischen Sprachen*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 528). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kutscher, Silvia (2010): On the expression of spatial relations in Ardeşen-Laz, (submitted).

Kutscher, Silvia & Genç, N. Sevim (1998): *Ardeşen narrates – Ardeşeni na isinapinenpe. A collection of Laz spoken texts with glosses and translations into English, German and Turkish*. (Languages of the World/Text collections 14). Unterschleißheim/München: Lincom Europa.

Kutscher, Silvia & Genç, N. Sevim (2007): Laz positional verbs: semantics and use with inanamiate Figures, in: Ameka, Felix & Levinson, Stephen C. (eds.), *The typology and semantics of locative predicates: posturals, positionals and other beasts*. Special issue of *Linguistics* 45 (5/6), 1029–1064.

Lacroix, Rene (2009): *Description du dialecte laze d'Àrhavi (caucasique du sud, Turquie). Grammaire et texts.* Thèse de doctorat en Science du Langage. Dirigée par Denis Creissels. Université Lumière Lyon 2. Ecole Doctorale Lettres, Langues, Lingustique et Arts.

Lakusta, Laura & Landau, Barbara (2005): Starting at the end: the importance of goals in spatial language, in: *Cognition* 96, 1–33.

Landau, Barbara & Zukowski, Andrea (2003): Objects, motions, and paths: spatial language in children with Williams syndrome, in: *Developmental Neuropsychology* 23(1/2), 107–139.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1987): *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites.* (Foundations of Cognitive Grammar 1). Standford: University.

Lazoğlu, Fahri & Feurstein, Wolfgang (1984): *Lazuri Alfabe. Lazca Alfabe. Entwurf eines lazischen Alphabetes*. Parpali 1. Lazuri Carelepe. Laz dili ve kültürü yayınları. Schriftenreihe zur lazischen Kultur. Freiburg (privately printed).

Lehmann, Christian (1983): Latin preverbs and cases, in: Pinkster, Harm (ed.), *Latin Linguistics and linguistic theory. Proceedings of the 1st international colloquium on Latin linguistics*, *Amsterdam, April 1981*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 145–161.

Lestrade, Sander (2008): The correspondence between directionality and transitivity, in: Asbury, Anna; Dotlačil, Jakub; Gehrke, Berit & Nouwen, Rick (eds.), *Syntax and semantics of spatial P.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 149–174.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2000): H. P. Grice on location on Rossel Island, in: Chang, Steve S.; Liaw, Lily & Ruppenhofer, Josef (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th annual meeting of the Berkely Linguistic Society. February 12–15, 1999*. Berkeley: BLS, 210–224.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2003): *Space in language and cognition. Explorations in cognitive diversity*. (Language, culture & cognition 5). Cambridge: University.

Levinson, Stephen C. & Meira, Sérgio (2003): 'Natural concepts' in the spatial topological domain – adpositional meanings in crossliguistic perspective: An exercise in semantic typology, in: *Language* 79(3), 485–516.

Levinson, Stephen C. & Wilkins, David (eds.) (2006): *Grammars of space. Explorations in cognitive diversity.* (Language, culture, and cognition 6). Cambridge: University.

Mattissen, Johanna (1995): Verbmorphology, in: Kutscher, Silvia; Mattissen, Johanna & Wodarg, Anke (eds.), *Das Mutafi-Lazische*. (Arbeitspapier 24, N.F.). Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 21–36.

Nikitina, Tatiana (2009): Subcategorization pattern and lexical meaning of motion verbs: a study of the source/goal ambiguity,in: *Linguistics* 47(5), 1113–1141.

Regier, Terry (1996): *The human semantic potential: Spatial language and constrained connectionism.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Regier, Terry (1997): Constraints on the learning of spatial terms: a computational investigation, in: Medin, Douglas L.; Schyns, Philippe & Goldstone, Robert (eds.), *Psychology of learning and motivation, vol. 36: Mechanisms of perceptual learning.* San Diego: Academic Press, 171–217.

Regier, Terry & Zheng, Mingyu (2007): Attention to endpoints: a cross-linguistic constraint on spatial meaning, in: *Cognitive Science* 31, 705–719.

Rosen, Georg (1844): *Über die Sprache der Lazen*. Lemgo/Detmold: Meyersche Hofbuchhandlung.

Stolz, Thomas (1992): *Lokalkasussysteme. Aspekte einer strukturellen Dynamik*. (Pro Lingua 13). Wilhelmsfeld: Egert.

Talmy, Lennard (1985): Lexicalisation patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms, in: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. 3.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57–201.

Wälchli, Bernhard & Zúñinga, Fernando (2006): Source-Goal (in)difference and the typology of motion events in the clause, in: *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 59(3), 284–303.

Silvia Kutscher
Exzellenzcluster 264 – TOPOI
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Unter den Linden 6
D - 10099 Berlin
GERMANY
silvia.kutscher@culture.hu-berlin.de